

2018 Current Fiscal Year Report: Biology of Development and Aging Integrated Review Group

Report Run Date: 06/05/2019 08:27:32 AM

1. Department or Agency

Department of Health and Human Services

2. Fiscal Year

2018

3. Committee or Subcommittee

Biology of Development and Aging Integrated Review Group

3b. GSA Committee No.

1863

4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?

No

5. Current Charter

01/03/1994

6. Expected Renewal Date

7. Expected Term Date

8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year?

No

8b. Specific Termination Authority

8c. Actual Term Date

9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year

Continue

10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?

Not Applicable

10b. Legislation Pending?

Not Applicable

11. Establishment Authority

Authorized by Law

12. Specific Establishment Authority

42 U.S.C. 282(b)(16)

13. Effective Date

11/20/1985

14. Committee Type

Continuing

14c. Presidential?

No

15. Description of Committee

Grant Review Committee

16a. Total Number of Reports

No Reports for this Fiscal Year

17a. Open Meetings and Dates 0 17b. Closed Meetings and Dates 2 17c. Partially Closed Meetings and Dates 0 17d. Total Meetings and Dates 2

Purpose

NIH Peer Review

Start

05/08/2018

End

- 05/09/2018

NIH Peer Review

07/13/2018

- 07/13/2018

Number of Committee Meetings Listed: 2

	Current FY	Next FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$3,200.00	\$3,200.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$85,253.00	\$86,872.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$2,130.00	\$2,173.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00

18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	\$163,650.00	\$166,924.00
18d. Total	\$254,233.00	\$259,169.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	0.40	0.40

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

Section 492 of the PHS Act states that The Secretary ... shall by regulation require appropriate technical and scientific peer review of -- (A) applications...; and (B) biomedical and behavioral research and development contracts . This committee is composed of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant applications and/or contract proposals in the fields of development and aging sciences. During this reporting period the committee reviewed 66 applications requesting \$31,518,809.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

This committee is composed of authorities knowledgeable in the disciplines and fields relation to morphogenesis and pattern formation; gastrulation; cell fate, lineage and differentiation; organogenesis; gametogenesis; pre- and post-implementation development; regeneration; evolutionary aspects of development; and the molecular basis of primordial birth defects; chromosome dynamics; cell cycle control; cell death; responses to stress; cellular signaling; the biology and applications of stem cells; tissue repair; determinants of longevity; age-related changes in physiological functions; geriatric syndromes and diseases; animal models of aging; predictive markers of biological health and aging; and mechanisms of exceptional aging.

20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

The committee held 2 meetings during this reporting period.

20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?

This committee is composed of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant applications and contract proposals. These evaluations and recommendations cannot be obtained from other sources because the specialized, complex nature of the applications and proposals requires a unique balance and breadth of expertise not available on the NIH staff or from other established sources.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

Meetings were closed to the public for the review of grant applications. Sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act permit the closing of meetings where discussions could reveal confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material and personal information, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

21. Remarks

This committee did not produce any public reports during the fiscal year. Due to the assignment of responsibilities within the Center, the roles of committee designated federal official and committee decision maker are filled by the same individual. Zip Codes: Due to the large number of members associated with this committee, NIH staff are unable to provide individual zip codes for all members. Current individual meeting rosters, including zip codes are available on line at <https://public.era.nih.gov/pubroster/>.

Designated Federal Officer

BRUCE REED Chief, Biology of Development and Aging IRG

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
ADEBAMOWO, CLEMENT	07/01/2017	07/16/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
AKINYEMIJU, TOMI	07/13/2018	07/13/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND ASSISTANT DEAN FOR INCLUSIVE EXCELLENCE	Peer Review Consultant Member
BETHONY, JEFFREY	05/08/2018	05/09/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
BRUGGEMAN, LESLIE	05/08/2018	05/09/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
COOPER, RICHARD	05/08/2018	05/09/2018	PROFESSOR AND CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member
EZEANOLUE, ECHEZONA	07/01/2015	06/30/2019	VICE PRESIDENT FOR INNOVATION	Peer Review Consultant Member
GOLUB, JONATHAN	07/13/2018	07/13/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
HOGAN, JOSEPH	07/13/2018	07/13/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
HUDGENS, MICHAEL	05/08/2018	05/09/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
JOHNSON, WARREN	07/01/2016	06/30/2018	PROFESSOR AND DIRECTOR	Peer Review Consultant Member

KWARA, AWEWURA	05/08/2018 05/09/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MARCONI, VINCENT	07/01/2016 06/30/2020	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MCELFISH, PEARL	05/08/2018 05/09/2018	ADJUNCT ASSISTANT PROFESSOR AND ASSOCIATE VICE-CHANCELLOR NORTHWEST ARKANSAS CAMPUS	Peer Review Consultant Member
METCALFE, JOHN	07/01/2018 06/30/2022	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MUNDERLOH, ULRIKE	07/01/2016 06/30/2020	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MURPHY, ROBERT	07/01/2016 06/30/2020	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SAJATOVIC, MARTHA	07/01/2018 06/30/2022	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SHERR, KENNETH	05/08/2018 05/09/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
TAYLOR, DIANE	07/01/2016 06/30/2020	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
VEDANTHAN, RAJESH	07/01/2018 06/30/2022	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
VERGHESE, JOE	07/01/2017 06/30/2021	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
WALTERS, KARINA	07/01/2014 06/30/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
WERE, MARTIN	07/13/2018 07/13/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
WHITE, LAURA	07/13/2018 07/13/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
WOLF, BETHANY	07/13/2018 07/13/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 25

Narrative Description

The goal of NIH research is to acquire new knowledge to help prevent, detect, diagnose, and treat disease and disability, from the rarest genetic disorder to the common cold. The NIH mission is to uncover new knowledge that will lead to better health for everyone. NIH works toward that mission by supporting the research of non-Federal scientists in universities, medical schools, hospitals, and research institutes throughout the country

and abroad. Section 492 of the PHS states that The Secretary ... shall by regulation require appropriate technical and scientific peer review of -- (A) applications...; and (B) biomedical and behavioral research and development contracts.

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Improvements to health or safety | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Trust in government | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Major policy changes | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Advance in scientific research | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Effective grant making | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Improved service delivery | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Increased customer satisfaction | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Outcome Comments

NA

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| None | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Unable to Determine | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Under \$100,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$100,000 - \$500,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$500,001 - \$1,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Over \$10,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Cost Savings Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Cost Savings Comments

NIH supported basic and clinical research accomplishments often take many years to unfold into new diagnostic tests and new ways to treat and prevent diseases.

What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

7,474

Number of Recommendations Comments

Grant Review

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments

The mission of the Center for Scientific Review is to provide the funding Institutes and Centers of NIH with the scientific and technical merit of research grant applications submitted to the NIH. It is these Institutes or Centers and their advisory councils that make funding decisions. NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be funded.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments

The mission of the Center for Scientific Review is to provide the funding Institutes and Centers of NIH with the scientific and technical merit of research grant applications submitted to the NIH. It is these Institutes or Centers and their advisory councils that make funding decisions. NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be funded.

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?

Yes ☒ No ☐ Not Applicable ☐

Agency Feedback Comments

Institute Program Staff provides the committee with data pertaining to funding actions taken.

What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?

Checked if Applies

Reorganized Priorities	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reallocated resources	<input type="checkbox"/>
Issued new regulation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Approved grants or other payments	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Action Comments

An action of "approved" or "recommended" for grants receiving initial peer review by this committee does not infer that the grant will be or has been funded. Research grant applications submitted to NIH must go through a two-step review process that includes the initial peer review for scientific and technical merit and a second step of review and approval by a National Advisory Council for program relevance. In addition, prior to an award or funding being made, NIH staff must conduct an administrative review for a number of other considerations. These include alignment with NIH's funding principles, review of the project budget, assessment of the applicant's management systems, determination of applicant eligibility, and compliance with public policy requirements. After all these steps have been completed, NIH officials make funding decisions on individual grant applications.

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

Yes

What is the estimated **Number** of grants reviewed for approval 66

What is the estimated **Number** of grants recommended for approval 66

What is the estimated **Dollar Value** of grants recommended for approval \$31,518,809

Grant Review Comments

Grant Review

How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

Checked if Applies

Contact DFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online Agency Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online Committee Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online GSA FACA Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Publications	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Access Comments

N/A